

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**JUL 02 2007**

1040 Broad Street, 2nd Floor, Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702
Tel: (732) 935-7100 Fax: (732) 935-7122
www.moseriplaw.com

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

THIS MESSAGE HAS SIX (6) PAGES INCLUDING THIS SHEET

TO: Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents - Commissioner for Patents -- U.S. Patent Office

FAX NO.: (571) 273-8300

FROM: Robert M. Brush

DATE: July 2, 2007

MATTER: Serial No. 09/918,600 Filed: July 30, 2001

DOCKET NO.: 16503-302501 (C5048AP07)

IN RE APPLICANT OF: Tseng et al.

The following has been received in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date of this facsimile:

| | |
|--|--|
| Petition for Extension of Time | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transmittal Letter |
| Disclosure Statement & PTO-1449 | Fee Transmittal (2 copies) |
| Priority Document | Deposit Account Transaction |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Response to Notice of Non-compliant Appeal | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Facsimile Transmission Certificate |
| Brief dated May 31, 2007 | dated July 2, 2007. |

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to the Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on July 2, 2007, Facsimile No. (571) 273-8300.

Angela M. Fiorino
Name of person signing this certificate

Angela M. Fiorino 7/2/07
Signature and date

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 02 2007

PTO/SB/21 (04-07)

Approved for use through 08/30/2007. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

5

Application Number

09/918,600

Filing Date

July 30, 2001

First Named Inventor

Tseng et al.

Art Unit

2128

Examiner Name

8219

Attorney Docket Number

16503-302501 (C5048AP07)

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

☐

Fee Transmittal Form

☐

Fee Attached

☐

Amendment/Reply

☐

After Final

☐

Affidavits/declaration(s)

☐

Extension of Time Request

☐

Express Abandonment Request

☐

Information Disclosure Statement

☐

Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)

☐

Reply to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application

☐

Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53

☐

Drawing(s)

☐

Licensing-related Papers

☐

Petition

☐

Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application

☐

Power of Attorney, Revocation

☐

Change of Correspondence Address

☐

Terminal Disclaimer

☐

Request for Refund

☐

CD, Number of CD(s)

☐

Landscape Table on CD

☐

After Allowance Communication to TC

☐

Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences

☐

Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)

☐

Proprietary Information

☐

Status Letter

☒

Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):

Response to Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief

Remarks

Although the Applicants believe no fees are due in connection with this response, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3562, for any fees, including extension of time or excess claim fees, required to make this response timely and acceptable to the Office.

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name

MOSER IP LAW GROUP

Signature

Printed name

Robert M. Brush

Date

July 2, 2007

Reg. No.

45,710

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature

Typed or printed name

Angela M. Fiorino

Date

July 2, 2007

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

63533-1

Appeal Brief – Supplemental Summary

Serial No. 09/918,600

Page 1 of 4

RECEIVED

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 02 2007

Docket No.: 16503-302501 (C5048AP07)

§ Serial No.: 09/918,600

Filed: July 30, 2001

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

§

Serial No.: 09/918,600

Group Art Unit: 2128

Confirmation No.: 8219

Examiner: Saxena, Akash

For: Behavior Processor System and Method

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF -
PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile under 37 C.F.R. §1.8 on July 2, 2007, and is addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

July 2, 2007
DateAngela M. Florino
Signature – Angela M. Florino

Dear Sir:

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF

In response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed May 31, 2007, please enter this supplemental summary section of the Appeal Brief. As this response is submitted within one month from the date of mailing of the Notice, Appellants believe that no fees are due in connection with this response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge counsel's Deposit Account No. 50-3562 for any fees, including extension of time fees, required to make this response timely and acceptable to the Office.

63490-1

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**JUL 02 2007****Appeal Brief – Supplemental Summary**
Serial No. 09/918,600
Page 2 of 4**REMARKS**

The Office noted that the summary of the claimed subject matter in Appellants' Appeal Brief is deficient in that independent claims 13, 27, and 32 are not mapped to the specification and drawings. In the Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief, the Examiner indicated that an entire brief need not be filed, only the section that was found defective. Appellants map claims 13, 27, and 32 to the specification and drawings below. Such description supplements the summary of claimed subject matter in the Appeal Brief, as well as the supplemental summary of claimed subject matter in the Reply Brief. The supplemental summary in the Reply Brief addressed specific summary-related issues set forth by the Examiner in the Examiner's Answer with respect to independent claim 1.

SUPPLEMENTAL SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Appellants' independent claim 13 recites a verification system (FIG. 100) for analyzing a user design. A host workstation (3106, FIG. 100) is provided for modeling and operating a software model of the user design. (Appellants' specification, p. 189, lines 1-9; p. 192, lines 13-18). As indicated in Appellants' specification, p. 189, lines 1-3, the "host workstation" is also referred to as an "RCC computing system." For further details of the RCC computing system, see Appellants' specification, p. 61, lines 3-16; FIG. 83. A reprogrammable hardware emulator (3107, FIG. 100) is provided for modeling a first hardware model of at least a portion of the user design. (Appellants' specification, p. 189, lines 1-9; p. 192, lines 13-18). As indicated in Appellants' specification, p. 189, lines 3-4, the "emulator" is also referred to as an "RCC hardware array." As described in Appellants' specification, p. 61, lines 17-24, the RCC hardware array (also referred to as an "RCC Hardware Accelerator") comprises reprogrammable hardware (e.g., an FPGA), hence a "reprogrammable hardware emulator" is disclosed. A behavior processor (3109a, FIG. 100) is provided for modeling a second hardware model of a selected portion of the user design. (Appellants' specification, p. 193, line 16 to p. 194, line 15). The reprogrammable hardware emulator models an RTL model of the user design ("first hardware model"), and the behavior processor may model traditionally non-synthesizable HDL code elements ("second hardware model").

63490-1

Appeal Brief – Supplemental Summary
Serial No. 09/918,600
Page 3 of 4

Appellants' independent claim 27 recites a method of verifying a user design where the verification environment includes a host workstation (3106, FIG. 100) for running a simulation of the user design and a testbench process. (Appellants' specification, p. 61, lines 3-16; FIG. 83). A behavioral portion of the user design is modeled in hardware. (Appellants' specification, p. 193, line 23 to p. 194, line 28). The behavioral portion may include a service request. (Appellants' specification, p. 199, lines 2-5; FIG. 105) (where the behavior processor is referred to as an "Xtrigger processor"). Exemplary service requests include: monitor and detect signal conditions in the RCC engine, change conditions on the fly during emulation runs, specify conditions in an easy, flexible, and powerful way, and evaluate conditions quickly in the RCC system. (Appellants' specification, p. 199, lines 3-10). A signal is sent to the testbench process in the host workstation upon the occurrence of the service request. (Appellants' specification, p. 204, lines 6-12).

Appellants' independent claim 32 recites a method of verifying a user design where the verification environment includes a host workstation (3106, FIG. 100) for running a simulation of the user design and a testbench process. (Appellants' specification, p. 61, lines 3-16; FIG. 83). A conditional portion of the user design is modeled and executed in a hardware environment. (Appellants' specification, p. 192, lines 5-9; p. 194, lines 18-28). An interrupt is sent to the testbench process in the host workstation upon the occurrence of at least one condition in the conditional portion. (Appellants' specification, p. 204, lines 6-12).

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 02 2007

Appeal Brief - Supplemental Summary
Serial No. 09/918,600
Page 4 of 4

CONCLUSION

Appellants submit that, in conjunction with the Appeal Brief and the Reply Brief, all independent claims have been summarized in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §41.37(c)(1)(v). Appellants respectfully request that the present matter be submitted for docketing as an appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

Moser IP Law Group

Date: July 2, 2007

By:


Robert M. Brush
Registration No. 45,710

MOSER IP LAW GROUP
1040 Broad Street - 2nd Floor
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702
(732) 935-7100

63490-1